PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

):					
				101	
			WRIT	TEN OPINION OF THE	
see form PCT/ISA/220			INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)		
pplic	ant's or agent's file reference		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
ee 1	form PCT/ISA/220			Priority date (day/month/year)	
tem	ational application No. //B2004/050831	International filing da 03.06.2004	te (day/month/year)	13.06.2003	
	ational Patent Classification (IPC	c) or both national classifica	tion and IPC		
04	N7/01, G06T3/40				
ilaa	cant				
10	NINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELEC	TRONICS N.V.			
_					
		he opinion		•	
	☑ Box No. II Priority			•	
		-lichmont of aninian with	regard to novelty, inver	ntive step and industrial applicability	
		.tfinentian		ntive step and industrial applicability	
	☐ Box No. IV Lack of u	nity of invention	43bis 1(a)(i) with regard	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
	☐ Box No. IV Lack of u ☐ Box No. V Reasone applicabl	.tfinentian	43bis 1(a)(i) with regard	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
	□ Box No. IV Lack of u □ Box No. V Reasone applicabl □ Box No. VI Certain d	nity of invention d statement under Rule lity; citations and explana ocuments cited lefects in the internationa	43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such s al application	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
	□ Box No. IV Lack of u □ Box No. V Reasone applicabl □ Box No. VI Certain d	nity of invention d statement under Rule lity; citations and explana ocuments cited lefects in the internationa	43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such s al application	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
2.	□ Box No. IV Lack of u □ Box No. VI Reasone applicable □ Box No. VI Certain of u □ Box No. VII Certain of u □ Box No. VIII Certain of u □ Box No. VIII Certain of u	nity of invention d statement under Rule lity; citations and explana ocuments cited lefects in the internations observations on the intern	43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such s al application national application	to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement	
2.	□ Box No. IV Lack of u □ Box No. VI Reasone applicable □ Box No. VI Certain of □ Box No. VII Certain of □ Box No. VIII Certain of ■ Box No. VIII Ce	nity of invention d statement under Rule dity; citations and explana ocuments cited efects in the international observations on the international preliminary examinational Preliminary Exa Authority other than this or Rule 66.1 bis(b) that with	43bis.1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such sal application national application on is made, this opinion mining Authority ("IPEA" one to be the IPEA and itten opinions of this Interpretations.	to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement will usually be considered to be a "). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notifed the ernational Searching Authority	
2.	Box No. IV Lack of use applicable. Box No. VI Reasone applicable. Box No. VII Certain of the Box No. VIII Certain of the Internation written opinion of the International Bureau under will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided submit to the IPEA a written on the IPEA	nity of invention d statement under Rule dity; citations and explanation ocuments cited efects in the international beservations on the international Preliminary examinational Preliminary Example 10 (2014) and 10 (2014) that will be above, considered to en reply together, where nailing of Form PCT/ISA/	43bis.1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such sal application national application on is made, this opinion mining Authority ("IPEA" one to be the IPEA and itten opinions of this Interpretable to be a written opinion of the local transport of the lo	to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement will usually be considered to be a "). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPFA has notifed the	
2.	Box No. IV Lack of u Box No. V Reasone applicabi Box No. VI Certain of Box No. VII Certain of Box No. VIII Certain of FURTHER ACTION If a demand for internation written opinion of the inter the applicant chooses an international Bureau unde will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provid submit to the IPEA a writte months from the date of m	nity of invention d statement under Rule dity; citations and explanation ocuments cited efects in the international beservations on the international Preliminary examinational Preliminary Example 10 (2014) and 10 (2014) that will be above, considered to en reply together, where nailing of Form PCT/ISA/	43bis.1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such sal application national application on is made, this opinion mining Authority ("IPEA" one to be the IPEA and itten opinions of this Interpretable to be a written opinion of the local transport of the lo	to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement will usually be considered to be a "). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notifed the ernational Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to the error to before the expiration of three	
2.	Box No. IV Lack of use applicable. Box No. VI Reasone applicable. Box No. VII Certain of Box No. VIII Certain of FURTHER ACTION If a demand for internation written opinion of the International Bureau unde will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provid submit to the IPEA a written months from the date of my whichever expires later. For further options, see F	nity of invention distatement under Rule dity; citations and explanation ocuments cited defects in the international observations on the international Preliminary examinational Preliminary Examination	43bis.1(a)(i) with regard ations supporting such sel application national application on is made, this opinion mining Authority ("IPEA' one to be the IPEA and itten opinions of this Interest of the awritten opinion of appropriate, with amendations of the expirations.	to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement will usually be considered to be a "). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notifed the ernational Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to the error to before the expiration of three	

Beaudoin, O

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2337



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/050831

	Box No	o. I Basis of the opinion
1.	With re	gard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	☐ Th lar	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following anguage—, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search and 23.1(b)).
2.	With re	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and early to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. type	of material:
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. forn	nat of material:
	. 🗆	in written format
		in computer readable form
	c. time	e of filing/furnishing:
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
	ł	n addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
	Λ Δddif	ional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/050831

	Priority								
. 🛭 The fo	ollowing document ha	s not beer	furnished:						
\boxtimes	copy of the earlier	application	whose pric	ority has been claimed	d (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(a)).				
	translation of the ea	arlier appli	cation who	se priority has been c	laimed (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(b)).				
Conse	equently it has not be theless been establis	en possibl	e to consid assumption	er the validity of the p on that the relevant da	priority claim. This opinion has ate is the claimed priority date.				
has h	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.								
3. Additional	observations, if nece	essary:		•	•				
					•				
•									
Box No. \	V Reasoned state I applicability; citati	ment und	er Rule 43	bis.1(a)(i) with regar	d to novelty, inventive step or statement				
ı Statemen	•								
1. Statemen				,	- 17				
1. Statemen Novelty (f	N)	Yes:	•	6,8	×				
	V)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	6,8 1-5,7,9-16					
Novelty (I	1		•						
	1	No:	Claims	1-5,7,9-16					
Novelty (I	1	No: Yes: No:	Claims	1-5,7,9-16 6,8					
Novelty (I	step (IS)	No: Yes: No:	Claims Claims Claims	1-5,7,9-16 6,8 1-5,7,9-16					
Novelty (I	step (IS)	No: Yes: No: Yes:	Claims Claims Claims Claims	1-5,7,9-16 6,8 1-5,7,9-16					

see separate sheet

PCT/IB2004/050831

Re Item V.

1 The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1: ZHAO M ET AL: "TOWARDS AN OVERVIEW OF SPATIAL UP-CONVERSION TECHNIQUES" PROCEEDINGS OF ISCE, XX, XX, 24 September 2002 (2002-09-24), pages 23-26

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Claim 1 is drafted in such general terms that its subject-matter falls within the disclosure of document D1.

Namely, Document D1 discloses an overview of spatial up-conversion techniques and an evaluation of their performances is presented: a comparison is established between an initial HD video signal and different HD interpolated video signals obtained by up-conversion of a SD video signal derived from the initial HD video signal.

In the DRC up-conversion method (see paragraph 2.A.), the coefficients for the data dependent interpolation filter are calculated thanks to a learning process employing both the initial HD video signal and the SD video signal as the training material. Hence, in this special case, the input signal of the DRC filter (the SD video signal) and the further input signal used to calculate filter coefficients (the initial HD video signal) are correlated.

3 INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 15 and 16

The subject-matter of independent claims 15 and 16 (method and computer program product derived from the spatial filter unit of claim 1) is for the same reasons not new.

PCT/IB2004/050831

4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-5, 7, 9-14

Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 9-14 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

5 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 6, 8

The combination of the features of dependent claims 6, 8 are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art. The reasons are as follows:

In document D1, the input signal and the further input signal are either both luminance or chrominance signals.

According to the invention, the input signal representing a first quantity (chrominance) is converted using coefficients calculated on basis of a further input signal representing a second different quantity (luminance) which is advantageous because the input signal conversion can profit from the further input signal data (since the input signal and the further input signal are correlated and the further input signal may be, for example, more detailed).